

yw



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
 United States Patent and Trademark Office
 Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
 P.O. Box 1450
 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/708,411	11/09/2000	John P. Veschi	VESCHI 19	2077

7590 01/26/2005

WILLIAM H. BOLLMAN
 MANELLI DENISON & SELTER
 2000 M STREET NW
 SUITE 700
 WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER

SHARMA, SUJATHA R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2684

DATE MAILED: 01/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/708,411	Applicant(s) VESCHI, JOHN P.	
	Examiner Sujatha Sharma	Art Unit 2684	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10/20/04.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

2. Claims 1,4-6,8,12,15,16,20,23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tanaka [US 6,542,749].

Regarding claims 1,8,12,16 and 20, Tanaka discloses a method and system for connecting proximately located mobile users based on compatible attributes. Tanaka further discloses the wireless device to be a wireless PDA device (see col. 4, lines 20-32) with a wireless front end and proximity detector (see summary of invention). Tanaka further discloses a reminder application that is triggered when the first mobile unit is in close proximate to a second mobile unit and automatically transferred from the first mobile unit/PDA to the second mobile unit/PDA (see col. 7, lines 1-10, col. 14, line 60 – col. 15, line 48, Col. 16, lines 54-57, col. 17, lines 1-56).

Regarding claim 4, Tanaka further discloses a proximity reminder table, in communication with reminder application, to associate other wireless PDA devices with specific reminder tasks. See Figs. 4,5 7, col. 5, line 39-col. 6, line 10, col. 4, lines 28-32, col. 6, line 66-col. 7, line 10 and col. 14, line 60 – col. 15, line 48, col. 17, lines 1-55.

Regarding claim 5, Tanaka further discloses a method where the reminder table comprises an entry associating a particular wireless PDA device with a desire to output an alert when said wireless PDA device becomes proximate to said particular wireless PDA device. See Figs. 4,5 7, col. 5, line 39-col. 6, line 10, col. 4, lines 28-32, col. 6, line 66- col. 7, line 10 and col. 14, line 60 – col. 15, line 48, col. 17, lines 1-55.

Regarding claim 6, Tanaka further discloses a method of disabling the communication/alert when said particular PDA device is in close proximate to said wireless PDA device. See col. 16, lines 54-63 and col. 19, lines 38-49.

Regarding claims 15 and 23, Tanaka discloses a method of measuring location coordinates of the first and second PDA device and determining the distance between the two devices and comparing the determined distance to a threshold distance. See col. 5, lines 1-20, col. 5, line 67 – col. 6, line 10.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2684

4. Claims 2,3,9-11,14,17-19,22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka [US 6,542,749] in view of Erikson [US 6,622,018].

Regarding claims 2,3 9-11,17-19, Tanaka as treated in claims 1,8,12,16,20 does not disclose the wireless front end to be a piconet / bluetooth front end.

Erikson in the same field of endeavor teaches a method of connecting various mobile devices in a piconet using bluetooth technology. See summary of invention, col. 5, lines 5-37.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the above teachings of Erikson to Tanaka in order to connect the various mobile devices when they are proximate to one another using bluetooth technology and thus overcoming the short comings of other short range communication methods such as infra red which would require line of sight between connecting devices.

Regarding claims 14 and 22, Erikson further teaches a method of determining g a presence of the second PDA device in a local wireless network/piconet of said first PDA device. See summary of invention, col. 5, lines 5-37.

5. Claims 13,21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka [US 6,542,749] in view of Berstis [US 6,650,894].

Regarding claims 13 and 21, Tanaka as treated in claims 12 and 20 does not disclose the reminder alert to be an audible alert.

Berstis in the same field of endeavor teaches a method of producing an audible alert when one mobile device is in close proximate to another mobile device. See col. 4, lines 58-67.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the above teachings of Berstis to Tanaka in order to Provides alert

Art Unit: 2684

information to the user, without having to look in particular direction and without having specifically asked if any message has been received.

Regarding claim 6, Berstis further discloses a method of disabling the communication/alert when said particular PDA device is in close proximate to said wireless PDA device. See col. 4, lines 58-67.

Regarding claim 7, Berstis further teaches a method of setting a time for the alert message and canceling the alert within a range of time of said time for said reminder alert. See col. 4, lines 58-67.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed 4/6/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the Tanaka reference fails to disclose a method to transfer information from one PDA to another PDA and further argues that the reference fails to teach a method of automatically transferring a reminder in the reminder application from one PDA to another PDA when the two PDAs are in close proximity to each other.

The examiner respectfully disagrees and draws the applicant's attention to Tanaka reference. Tanaka discloses a method where a user/PDA (See col. 4, lines 20-32 where a mobile unit is also a PDA) coming within predetermined triggering distance to any other active user/PDA may receive a phone call or other automatic creation of a telecommunication connection (see col. 16, lines 54-57). Tanaka further discloses that the user can receive an automatic reminder phone call when within predetermined distance from a previously promised social obligation/user/PDA (see col. 15, lines 35-39). Tanaka also discloses a method where ad-

Art Unit: 2684

hoc meeting information can be triggered when users are in close proximity to each other (see col. 17, lines 48-56).


Therefore the rejections of the claims 1-23 as discussed above are considered proper.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sujatha Sharma whose telephone number is 703-305-5298. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 7.30am - 4.00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nay Maung can be reached on 703-308-7745. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Sujatha Sharma
January 12, 2005


NAY MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER